

Q1 What was the address of the project?

Answered: 9 Skipped: 0

#	Responses	Date
1	2304 south third st	1/10/2014 7:43 AM
2	sorry, can't say	1/8/2014 4:31 PM
3	2610 Friar Tuck 78704	1/2/2014 9:42 PM
4	do not wish to publish	1/2/2014 7:00 PM
5	7003 E. Riverside	12/26/2013 8:22 AM
6	6107 Ponca	12/18/2013 10:32 AM
7	Zilker Park	12/13/2013 4:34 PM
8	2003 Rabb Road	12/12/2013 3:34 PM
9	1332 Lamar Square Drive	12/3/2013 1:38 PM

Q2 What was the zoning?

Answered: 9 Skipped: 0

#	Responses	Date
1	Residential	1/10/2014 7:43 AM
2	SF-6	1/8/2014 4:31 PM
3	SF-2	1/2/2014 9:42 PM
4	SF-3	1/2/2014 7:00 PM
5	ERC & SF-6	12/26/2013 8:22 AM
6	SF-3-NP	12/18/2013 10:32 AM
7	P	12/13/2013 4:34 PM
8	Residential	12/12/2013 3:34 PM
9	MF 2 to MF 6 with conditional overlay	12/3/2013 1:38 PM

Q3 Describe the project. What was the building type, square footage, number of stories, amount of parking?

Answered: 9 Skipped: 0

#	Responses	Date
1	Adding a 196 sq ft guest house	1/10/2014 7:43 AM
2	detached SF homes, but done with a site plan, so technically, condos. 5 units per acre density. 2300 sf homes, 2 story.	1/8/2014 4:31 PM
3	Single family home approx. 1000 sf, adding 100 sf taking outdoor storage to indoor laundry room-- single story	1/2/2014 9:42 PM
4	2 stories, single family residence, 2000 - 3000 sf, 2 - 4 parking spaces	1/2/2014 7:00 PM
5	MF project with single-unit structures in SF-6 area with 3 story MF buildings at ERC.	12/26/2013 8:22 AM
6	Lee Meadows is a small 11-unit single-family detached subdivision. After finally getting funding to develop an environmental assessment requirement further delayed the process and we needed to apply for a "subdivision construction permit" extension. Apparently no one had ever done one of these before; repeat: there is no process for getting a "SUBDIVISION CONSTRUCTION PERMIT" extension.	12/18/2013 10:32 AM
7	renovation to add ADA access	12/13/2013 4:34 PM
8	Addition of a guest house.	12/12/2013 3:34 PM
9	2, 3, and 4 stories based on compatibility standards Considered congregate living not apartments due to robust support services and parking reduced	12/3/2013 1:38 PM

Q4 Did you have to get special approvals (via provisions, waivers, variances, etc.) to complete your project?

Answered: 9 Skipped: 0

#	Responses	Date
1	No	1/10/2014 7:43 AM
2	ALWAYS a "special" approval to get on every project.	1/8/2014 4:31 PM
3	no special approvals required	1/2/2014 9:42 PM
4	no	1/2/2014 7:00 PM
5	Very small AEC considerations in the SF-6 area.	12/26/2013 8:22 AM
6	Yes. We were required to submit an informal request to review the project; and then formally request a review of it.	12/18/2013 10:32 AM
7	tree mitigation approvals	12/13/2013 4:34 PM
8	no	12/12/2013 3:34 PM
9	Zoning change, conditional use permit, and code amendment needed as neighborhood opposed zoning variance and City imposed commercial design standards	12/3/2013 1:38 PM

Q5 What were the key issues with the code or the process on this project?

Answered: 9 Skipped: 0

#	Responses	Date
1	The inspectors refused to come when someone was available to show them the property. They inspected the wrong property and failed ours. They stated we had not done things that were not required. They added in the top step if the stairs to the floor dimension, which put is over 196sq feet and would have demanded a building permit. The voice mail was full repeatedly when I tried to call. The office folks are not respectful of people's time. I had to take 2 days off work to deal with this. Tony Hernandez refused to work with my builder. There is no outlet for complaints, the permit office works without oversight and the management refuses to talk to "people" (I was specifically told this when I asked to speak with management)	1/10/2014 7:43 AM
2	RSMP - this project was part of a previously designed regional detention pond, including 2, 10, 25, and 100 year storms. BUT, the city didn't honor that, because they have decided that 2 year flows must be detained no matter what, even though the channels and conveyance system was designed for it. HUGE unforeseen cost. Also, we were adjacent to a PUD, with a density of 5.5 homes per acre. but because it was technically single family, and we were technically sf-6, we had to stay out of a 25' compatibility setback (NOTHING is allowed in the setback....some reviewers say no fences, most say no drainage ditches or swales. Most say no sidewalks or community gardens or parks?? is that what the code was meant to stop???) We couldn't even put our driveway in the setback. Why do we need a setback if we are building the exact same thing (detached SF homes) and a LOWER density than our neighbor??	1/8/2014 4:31 PM
3	Contractor made some interesting mistakes that we thought the COA inspectors should have caught....	1/2/2014 9:42 PM
4	"McMansion Ordinance" (AKA McFranken Ordinance) is completely whack. not only is this section of the code irresponsible - it is bloated with an "everything-but-the-kitchen-sink" approach. this section of the code was ill-conceived and written without any intelligent input from the professional design community. this section of the code also suffers from a "prescriptive" formal bias (it TELLS designers what to design and how to design based upon accommodations for "typical" building elements) because the code was written by non-professionals who could not imagine anything otherwise. the code itself is also inherently contradictory and in portions it is totally unintelligible in that it is self-contradictory and replete with triple negatives.	1/2/2014 7:00 PM
5	Staff interpretation is that the ERC buildings must be built first. It should never be a requirement that any vertical phase of construction be mandated by code to be built first.	12/26/2013 8:22 AM
6	Main issue is that nothing had changed in the project. We simply needed a permit extension to develop the subdivision. After an informal submission confirmed we weren't making any changes; we now had to submit a formal request to review--and it goes through ALL reviewers again. Each submission (informal and formal) requires a RED-STAMPED set of plans which comes at great expense. The review went through planning and then a separate review through Austin Water Utility--which then required an update of certain details. The project was already approved; why new details; we just needed an extension.	12/18/2013 10:32 AM
7	replacement of trees required in limits of construction	12/13/2013 4:34 PM
8	Every time our architect and then builder went to the city, they were given different information about what could be built. We just wanted to know where we could build it. We had 1/2 acre so could either attach or not attach. We were told attaching it was ok. Then several years later we discovered that because it was attached we were restricted from being able to rent it, but if it had been built detached it would not be a problem. This was never explained, plus the code office made the process take so many months with the different decisions back and forth.	12/12/2013 3:34 PM
9	Over head electric had to be replaced with underground electric at owner's expense and connection to lift station on adjoining property. Water line had to be replaced at owner's expense in City right-of-way at owner's expense because existing line did not meet state standards for distance to property line.	12/3/2013 1:38 PM

Q6 Do you have suggestions about how the code and/or the process should have worked to get a better outcome?

Answered: 9 Skipped: 0

#	Responses	Date
1	The offices should be open for 1 evening and 1/2 day Saturdays. The employees should be trained in customer service and communication. Every employee should be required to keep their voice mail clear, and if this is not possible, their calls should roll to someone who can take a message. The employees should be better educated in the use of their own computer systems. There should be online payment support	1/10/2014 7:43 AM
2	have the code make sense. have it changed to avoid unintended consequences like this. McMansion is another great example.....it was meant to stop me from buying a small lot btwn two small homes and building a giant home on that lot. that is not a bad idea, but there are already tons of limits (building setbacks, impervious cover limits, height limits) on the lots. why aren't those good enough. and if i have 10 lots in a row and i'm building/selling the homes, why do i have to follow mcmansion?? it was meant to protect existing homeowners, not new construction. the INTENT is being warped/misinterpreted.	1/8/2014 4:31 PM
3	How about having the inspectors advise the people writing the code?	1/2/2014 9:42 PM
4	any intelligent revision of the code has to DELETE "typical typological" prescriptive aspects (it cannot tell designers what the buildings need to look like but rather has to provide abstract rules and guidelines) and it also has to accommodate contemporary architecture. also, currently the code has a goulash of various types of restrictions and it should really focus on a SINGLE set of concerns. either it should tell us what the envelope needs to be /or/ it should penalize us for ceilings over 18' but doing both is confusing to say the least. also, staff interpretations of this kind of madness are worthy attempts but they end up so tortured and over-prescriptive as to be maddening. right now working within the code as a contemporary architect or builder is like solving a Rubiks cube inside an MC Escher drawing. also PLEASE don't default to this idiocy in city planning that re-transcribes the Duany-Plater-Zyberk-Calthorpe interpretation of 19th century towns. someone please try and look up the books and research of MVRDV or the book by SHOP called "A County of Cities" or similar ideas that are worthy of a WORLD CLASS AMERICAN CITY.	1/2/2014 7:00 PM
5	Interpretation is wrong and must be clarified. Intents of code provisions could go a long way in the wrong direction.	12/26/2013 8:22 AM
6	This is not complicated. Why two submissions (i.e., informal and formal)? Each requires an application; and several RED-STAMPED set of plans.	12/18/2013 10:32 AM
7	on heavily wooded site, tree mitigation should be allowed offsite where trees would be of more value	12/13/2013 4:34 PM
8	They should have provided the owner with the code information that would have helped us understand any future restrictions that we would have based on the decisions we were making. Instead, all the information was given to the builder, and it didn't necessarily get translated to us in the right way.	12/12/2013 3:34 PM
9	Density bonus standards available on vacant land for affordable housing could be applied for redevelopment as well. Cost participation for infrastructure expenses available for non-affordable housing could have been available. Affordable housing with robust support services could cease being a conditional use in multifamily. height at three stories could have been allowed with no affected property owner objected.	12/3/2013 1:38 PM

Q7 Is there anything else you would like to share regarding the land development code?

Answered: 7 Skipped: 2

#	Responses	Date
1	stop writing rules and regs to avoid the worst case scenario. they take one bad example/occurrence and act like it happens every day and we need a new rule to stop it. there are exceptions, isolated incidents, etc. they need to learn the difference!	1/8/2014 4:31 PM
2	Enforcement should not be complaint driven—that system punishes the people that do the right thing.	1/2/2014 9:42 PM
3	yeah. someone has to take the contemporary design community seriously and involve them in this process. if you rely on AIA Austin to do this the new code will be Dead on Arrival and we will be redoing it in another 10 years. in the intervening years i will continue to see photos of Austin in serious academic books demonstrating terribly planned and terribly executed cities and city amenities.	1/2/2014 7:00 PM
4	Don't get me started. Oops. Too late. More coming. Stay tuned.	12/26/2013 8:22 AM
5	The entire process is inefficient; there is no clear flow of the process. Nothing is ever clear; instructions/process is convoluted and often buried. APPARENTLY THERE IS NO CLEAR PROCESS FOR A SUBDIVISION CONSTRUCTION PERMIT EXTENSION. WE HAD TO SUBMIT FOR A SITE PLAN CORRECTION ONLY BECAUSE NEW DETAILS WERE CREATED; NOT BECAUSE ANY PART OF THE PROJECT CHANGED.	12/18/2013 10:32 AM
6	We live in the inner city. We are retired. We have owned our home for many years. We have people all around us who are being forced to sell their homes because of the restrictive codes that doesn't allow them to bring in rental income for the ADU's unless they happen to fit into the very narrow rules for when ADU's can be rented, while everyone's taxes have gone sky high, forcing retired people to look for ways to bring in income from their property in order to stay living there. It is a very sad situation when developers are treated better than people who have lived in their homes for years and years and they can't work with the city to stay there because of the code restrictions for ADU's, yet developers will get all kinds of variances to build huge McMansions in their place.	12/12/2013 3:34 PM
7	S.M.A.R.T. Housing fast track review standards are not followed, and this contributes to larger budgets for construction as labor and material costs rise in a highly competitive market.	12/3/2013 1:38 PM